

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-40 are pending. Claims 1, 6-12, 13, 18-24, 25, 30-36 and 37-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20030167197 to Shoemaker et al. ("Shoemaker"). Claims 2, 3, 14 15, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Shoemaker in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,107,268 to Zawadzki et al. ("Zawadzki"). Claims 4, 5, 16, 17, 28, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Shoemaker in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020016910 to Wright et al. ("Wright"). Claims 4-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner has also objected to informalities in the Abstract.

Applicants' Reply

Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejections of claims 1, 6-12, 13, 18-24, 25, 30-36 and 37-40, claims 2-5, 14-17, and 26-29, and claims 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), § 103(a), and §112, second paragraph, respectively. In this response, Applicants amend claims 1, 13, 25 and 37. Support for the amendments can be found, e.g., in paragraphs [0010], [0011] and [0018] of the Specification.

Objections to the Specification

The Applicant has amended the Abstract, which is now in compliance with MPEP § 608.01(b), and requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶2

Claims 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Applicant has amended claim 1 to include a reading step. Applicant believes that this overcomes the alleged indefiniteness of dependent claims 4-9 and requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 6-12, 13, 18-24, 25, 30-36 and 37-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Shoemaker.

Applicant's independent claim 1 is directed to a method for accessing sales data. Among other things, claim 1 provides for "determining at least one natural language question that is authorized to be presented to the web page based on the determined service level associated with the account."

The Examiner alleges that paragraphs [0018] and [0019], and Figure 2 of Shoemaker disclose this limitation. Applicants respectfully disagree. Shoemaker neither discloses nor suggests this element or limitation of claim 1.

Instead, Shoemaker describes a system wherein managers log in using a username and password to access an account management tool. After logging in, an account listing is provided on a computer screen as shown in Figure 2 of Shoemaker. Shoemaker also describes a search tool that allows managers to search for particular account managers. (*See* Shoemaker, paragraphs [0018] and [0019], and Figure 2). Shoemaker does not disclose or suggest an

account management tool that uses at least one natural language question that is authorized to be presented to the web page based on the determined service level associated with the account as recited in claim 1. Applicants note that presenting a list of customer accounts that can be viewed by the manager on the screen is not the same as the use of natural language questions as recited in claim 1. The use of natural language questions leads to more easily understandable searches and allows for the answers to specific questions. (*See Specification, page 2*). In contrast, in Shoemaker, after logging in, the user is presented with a listing of all accounts for particular account managers in a particular geographic area. Access to account listings as described in Shoemaker does not provide this benefit and does not disclose or suggest at least one natural language question that is authorized to be presented to the web page based on the determined service level associated with the account as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Shoemaker does not disclose all the limitations of claim 1. Independent claim 1 is, therefore, not anticipated by Shoemaker and is allowable. Since claim 1 is allowable, claims 6-12 depending therefrom are also allowable.

Applicant's independent claim 13 is directed towards a logic arrangement that includes determining at least one natural language question that is authorized to be presented to the web page based on the service level associated with the account and populating a list control element of the web page with the at least one question which is analogous to the features included in independent method claim 1. Applicant's independent claim 25 is therefore allowable for at least the reasons provided with respect to independent claim 1.

Applicant's independent claim 25 is a system claim that includes determining at least one natural language question that is authorized to be presented to the web page based on the service

level associated with the account and populating a list control element of the web page with the at least one question which is analogous to the features included in independent method claim 1. Applicant's independent claim 25 is therefore allowable for at least the reasons provided with respect to independent claim 1. Since claim 25 is allowable, claims 30-36 depending therefrom are also allowable.

Applicant's independent claim 37 is a system claim that includes selecting one of an at least one natural language question from a first list control element on a web page which is analogous to the features included in independent method claim 1. Applicant's independent claim 37 is therefore allowable for at least the reasons provided with respect to independent claim 1. Since claim 37 is allowable, claims 38-40 depending therefrom are also allowable.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2, 3, 14 15, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Shoemaker in view of Zawadzki. Claims 4, 5, 16, 17, 28, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Shoemaker in view of Wright. These claims are patentable for at least the same reasons that their respective parent claims (1, 13, and 25) are patentable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants hereby authorize the Commissioner to charge payment of any additional fees or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 02-4377. In the event that the application is not deemed in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in an effort to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

By: 

Manu J. Teiwani
Patent Office Reg. No. 37,985

30 Rockefeller Center
New York, NY 10112-4498
(212) 408-2500

Attorneys for Applicant(s)